

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended.

Claims 1, 2, 10, 13, 17, 20, 24 and 25 have been amended. Claims 18 and 21-23 have been cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-17, 19, 20, 24 and 25 are presented for examination.

In the Office Action, a restriction requirement has been asserted. Applicants elect claims 1-20, and 24-25 for examination.

Claims 1, 3-6, 10-12, 17-19 and 24-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over DeRose et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,708,806). Applicants submit that the present claims are patentable over DeRose.

DeRose discloses a data processing system and method for generating a representation of an electronic document and displaying the electronic document, formatted according to a style sheet, on an output device. See DeRose at col. 3, ll. 14-21. An element, or node, of the tree is defined by the markup in the electronic document. An element may contain text. The text content may be considered to be a child element of its containing element. Each element in an electronic document is assigned a type name according to its markup. The type name may also include the type names of a parent element and of previous parent elements, thus indicating the context in which an element occurs in the document. Such a type name is called a qualified name. The type name identifying the complete context of an element is the fully-qualified name. A document is also provided with one or more style sheets for specifying format characteristics for its display. A style sheet includes format characteristics for type names of elements in the document (col. 3, ll. 22-50).

Claim 1 recites associating each identifier with a region defining an area on a document page and formatting each data record within the corresponding region. Applicants submit that there is no disclosure in DeRose of associating an identifier with a region defining an area on a document page. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over DeRose. Claims

2-9 depend from claim 1 and include additional limitations. Therefore, claims 2-9 are also patentable over DeRose.

Claim 10 recites associating each identifier with one of one or more regions defining an area on a document page. For the reasons described above with respect to claim 1, claim 10 is also patentable over DeRose. Because claims 11-16 depend from claim 10 and include additional limitations, claims 11-16 are also patentable over DeRose.

Claim 17 recites associating each identifier with one of one or more regions, wherein each data record is formatted within the one or more regions defining an area on a document page. For the reasons described above with respect to claim 1, claim 17 is also patentable over DeRose. Because claims 19 and 20 depend from claim 17 and include additional limitations, claim 17 is also patentable over DeRose.

Claim 24 recites associating each identifier with one of one or more regions defining an area on a document page. For the reasons described above with respect to claim 1, claim 24 is also patentable over DeRose.

Claim 25 recites a processor configured to associate each identifier with one of one or more regions defining an area on a document page. For the reasons described above with respect to claim 1, claim 25 is also patentable over DeRose.

Claims 2, 13, 14-16 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over DeRose et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,708,806) in view of W3C, HTML 4.01 Specification: W3C Recommendation (HTML 4.01). Applicants submit that the present claims are patentable over DeRose even in view of HTML 4.01.

HTML 4.01 discloses tables that have an associated caption that provides a description of a table's purpose. See HTML 4.01 at 11.1. Nevertheless, there is no disclosure of associating an identifier with a table such that a data record is formatted within the table. As discussed above, DeRose does not disclose or suggest associating an identifier with one of one or more regions defining an area on a document page. Therefore, any combination of DeRose and HTML 4.01 would also not disclose or suggest such a limitation.

Accordingly, the present claims are patentable over the combination of DeRose and HTML 4.01.

Claims 7-9 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over DeRose in view of Hakon Wium Lie, W3C Core Styles, 1997 (Core). Applicants submit that the present claims are patentable over DeRose even in view of Core.

Core discloses style sheets. However, there is no disclosure of associating an identifier with a table such that a data record is formatted within the table. As discussed above, DeRose does not disclose or suggest associating an identifier with one of one or more regions defining an area on a document page. Thus, any combination of DeRose and Core would also not disclose or suggest such a limitation. Consequently, the present claims are patentable over the combination of DeRose and Core.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome, and that the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: August 22, 2003

Mark L. Watson
Reg. No. 46,322

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(303) 740-1980